

CHAPTER 3 STATE SITE VISITS

I. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we present the findings from site visits to five states: California, Connecticut, Florida, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The site visits had two objectives: first, to gather contextual evidence of the overall effect of welfare reform on SSA programs; and second, to identify resources for use in possible future evaluations of the effects of welfare reform on SSA programs. Because two other SSA projects have conducted site visits which focused on the effects of the SSA DA&A and child disability reforms, the primary focus of this set of site visits was to obtain further information about the likely effects of the non-SSA reforms, specifically reforms in AFDC/TANF. Our findings are based on information gathered from interviews with numerous state agency officials, advocates, and SSA field office staff, and, when available, information from state reports and independent evaluations.

In the remainder of this chapter, we further describe the purpose of the site visits within the context of this project. We also discuss the criteria used to select states for the site visits, and the attributes of the five states ultimately selected. We conclude the chapter with a summary of the findings from the visits. Full reports on the findings specific to each of the site visit states are contained in *Appendix C*.

II. PURPOSE OF THE SITE VISITS

The primary objective of the site visits was to gain a better contextual understanding of the impact of the non-SSA welfare reforms on the SSA disability programs. The information gathered through the site visits was very useful in helping us to further understand how state and local policies and programs, as well as socioeconomic and cultural factors, have influenced the populations affected by PRWORA and BBA. Of particular interest to this study are policies and initiatives implemented by the following programs and organizations: state AFDC waiver and demonstration projects in effect prior to the passage of PRWORA; state TANF programs instituted after PRWORA; state and local General Assistance programs; state Medicaid programs; SSA field offices; state disability determination services; and local advocacy and service organizations. The information collected through the site visits regarding the perceived impact of state and local welfare reform initiatives was used to gauge the viability of specific research hypotheses, and to inform the development of quantitative analyses designed to estimate the impact of the non-SSA reforms on the DI and SSI disability programs.

A second objective of the site visits was to obtain detailed information on: on-going welfare evaluations of interest; the availability of state or local administrative or survey data; and the potential for linking the state data to SSA administrative data. Administrative databases of interest include: AFDC/TANF files, Medicaid files, Food Stamp files, public education files (especially special education), foster care and other child protective services files, Unemployment Insurance wage records, the Job Training and Partnership Act Standardized Program Information Reporting (SPIR) data, and others. The nature and availability of state-level data on populations affected by the legislation has implications for some of the potential

study designs for quantitatively assessing the impact of non-SSA welfare reforms on the SSA programs.

III. METHODS

A. Selection of States and Localities

We selected the five states we visited on the basis of the states' AFDC/TANF policies and potential opportunities in each state for quantitative analyses of the impact of welfare reform on the SSA programs. In making our selection, we considered the following factors: size of the welfare population; "interesting" state waiver provisions outside the basic federal requirements; program time limits; stringent work requirements; subsidized employment opportunities; evidence of past shifting of welfare recipients from state to federal rolls; and region of the country. Below, we describe the reasons for selecting each of the five states.

- **California** has the largest welfare population in the United States, including a disproportionate share of drug addicts and alcoholics and immigrants who are affected by the SSA-related reforms. In addition, California had ongoing waiver demonstration projects from 1992 until January 1998, when it implemented its TANF program entitled California Work Opportunities and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs). Finally, as evidenced by the number of recent and ongoing welfare evaluation and research efforts in California, the state and county welfare officials are supportive of welfare program research and the use of administrative databases in such research efforts.
- **Connecticut** implemented a reform program, Reach For Jobs First, in January 1996 as an amendment to an earlier program. There is a 21-month time limit on benefits and progressive full family sanctions for cases not complying with work, job search, or child support enforcement requirements. To comply fully with PRWORA, Connecticut made minor adjustments to Reach For Jobs First and renamed the program Jobs First, in July 1997. The Connecticut Department of Social Services is currently evaluating the program using a random assignment experimental design.
- **Florida** has historically been one of the leading states in the nation in welfare experimentation. In 1994, it obtained federal welfare reform waivers to implement its Family Transition Program in two counties. The Family Transition Program was one of the first in the country to combine a 'Work First' approach with time limited benefits. Florida has adopted much of the Family Transition Program's philosophy into its TANF program, Work and Gain Economic Self-Sufficiency (WAGES), which the State implemented in October 1996. The State of Florida also maintains detailed historical data on its AFDC/TANF program and a rich database on employment and program participation outcomes for persons exiting Florida high schools as well as other state programs and institutions.
- **Michigan** has a long history of waiver demonstration projects dating back to 1992. Michigan has immediate work requirements and community service after two months, but its program time limits are the same as the federal requirements. In addition, Michigan had experience with shifting General Assistance (GA) recipients onto SSI, and a study has been conducted on this change using linked State GA and SSA disability program data. Finally,

Michigan had a large population of child and DA&A cases that were affected by the recent reforms. Michigan implemented its TANF program, the Family Independence Program (FIP), in October 1996.

- **Wisconsin** has a particularly rich history of welfare reform. Wisconsin's welfare reform efforts pre-date the passage of PRWORA, and the state has seen dramatic reductions in its welfare caseload over the past ten years. In addition, Wisconsin is the site of several interesting evaluation and data collection efforts. Wisconsin's welfare programs operated under a variety of welfare reform waivers after PRWORA until it implemented Wisconsin Works (W-2) in September 1997.

Within each state, we used a few basic criteria for selecting local areas to visit. We gave first priority to visiting state capitals to facilitate interviews with state welfare officials. We also generally visited the metropolitan areas within the states having the largest number or highest concentration of potentially affected populations. In addition, we tried to select local areas that had on-going welfare evaluations and that had particularly interesting data on welfare recipients. Finally, because each site visit was limited to three days, we worked to ensure that travel among localities and within localities did not consume excessive time.

B. Sources of Information

In each state, we interviewed representatives from federal, state, and local government agencies as well as advocates and private service providers. We gave top priority to meeting with representatives from state welfare agencies, state Disability Determination Services (DDS), and SSA District/Field Offices. These "first tier" interviews included discussions of: the nature of recent non-SSA welfare policies and efforts; the potential impacts of these policies on the state welfare agency, clients, and the SSA programs; the agency's ability to meet the needs of clients with disabilities; the quality and quantity of services provided; issues surrounding funding and budgetary constraints; client ability and willingness to participate in provided services; and any other observations relevant to the impact of specific policies on the SSA programs. We also discussed the availability of data on welfare clients and the feasibility of linking those data to SSA administrative files.

We also conducted interviews with representatives from local public or private agencies that provide direct services to clients or act as advocates for groups affected by the recent legislation. These included agency directors and direct service providers from organizations such as the state Medicaid office, community mental health centers, agencies serving the homeless, medical care providers, advocacy groups, and others identified in interviews with lead agency staff. As with the state welfare agencies, the content of the interviews consisted of discussion regarding recent changes in policy and any new efforts that would affect the propensity of clients to seek DI or SSI, impacts of these policies on the agency and on clients, the agency's ability to meet the needs of clients with disabilities, the quality and quantity of services provided, issues surrounding funding and budgetary constraints, client ability and willingness to participate in provided services, and any other observations relevant to the impact of specific policies on the SSA programs.

IV. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

A. Effect of State Welfare Reforms on SSA Programs and People with Disabilities

The effects of state reforms on SSA programs and people with disabilities identified in the five states we visited can be categorized as follows: effects on transitions to SSI; effects on the employment services available to people with disabilities; effects on the welfare safety net for persons with disabilities; and effects on the administration of the SSA programs. We describe our findings under each of these topics below.

1. Transitions to SSI

In only one of the states we visited was there the perception that the recent welfare reforms had caused increased transitions to SSI. In Connecticut, interviewees indicated that the recent reforms (time limits and strict work requirements) may have resulted in a small increase in transitions to SSI, but that such an increase may be difficult to perceive empirically because of the myriad of other recent SSA and non-SSA program changes affecting SSI participation in the state. Interviewees in the other four states acknowledged the now increased incentive for recipients with disabilities to apply for SSI given the stricter work requirements of their TANF programs, and increased incentives for states to help them obtain SSI, but there is no perception of an actual migration to SSI following the most recent reforms. There are several reasons for this. First, most of the states we visited have been identifying and actively referring potential SSI-eligible welfare recipients to SSI since the early 1990s. Interviewees in California, Michigan and Connecticut all described large-scale past efforts to identify persons with disabilities participating in state welfare programs and refer them to SSI. Although, in some states, it could be that most of these potentially eligible persons on the AFDC/TANF rolls have already been shifted to SSI. In Florida, interviewees also indicated that the historically low AFDC benefit would have already induced individuals seeking income support to apply for SSI. Second, the time limits for benefit receipt had not yet elapsed for any recipients in the TANF programs. Interviewees in California, Connecticut, and Florida indicated that substantial increases in transitions to SSI, if they are to be observed at all, will probably not occur for 1 to 2 years in Florida and Connecticut, and 3 to 4 years in California.

Interviewees in Wisconsin cited different reasons for the perceived absence of induced transitions to SSI. One is that the recently implemented W-2 program, to date, has not begun to focus on the hard-to-serve recipients in their program. One of the contractors administering the W-2 program in Milwaukee indicated that they will be focusing more on persons with disabilities participating in W-2 in the coming months and that one of their strategies may well be to refer them to and assist them in applying for SSI. SSA field office staff indicated that they have planned to conduct training sessions in the future with W-2 staff on SSI eligibility to help them more effectively identify and assist persons who may be eligible. A second explanation, expressed by several advocates in Wisconsin, is that many of the individuals who could apply for SSI are slipping through the cracks for two reasons: 1) the new W-2 administrators do not have adequate knowledge of or experience with the SSI program to effectively refer potentially eligible W-2 participants; and 2) the state's policy to divert individuals from the TANF program

also extends to the other federal programs (including SSI, Food Stamps, and Medicaid) because the state does not want former AFDC recipients appearing in any other program statistics, as this would refute the appearance that the state has successfully put the vast majority of its former welfare recipients to work.

We asked many knowledgeable people about the possible effects of Food Stamp and Medicaid reforms on SSI. None perceived or expected a significant effect of these reforms on the SSI program.

2. *Employment Services Available to Persons with Disabilities*

In most of the states we visited, interviewees indicated that the recent TANF reforms have resulted in increased employment services and other resources available to persons with disabilities, and that these new efforts could dampen excess flows to SSI in response to TANF. In California, the CalWORKs program provides special services to recipients with substance abuse and mental or emotional impairments, and the Employment Readiness Demonstration focuses on the hard-to-serve, including people with disabilities, assisting them in finding and maintaining employment. In Connecticut, persons with disabilities are encouraged to address barriers to employment in their Employability Plans. The state then provides training and rehabilitation services designed to assist persons with disabilities return to work. In Florida, the Florida Developmental Disabilities Council has received funding through a US Department of Labor Welfare-to-Work grant to assist long-term welfare recipients with learning and other disabilities in finding and retaining jobs. In Michigan, TANF recipients who apply for SSI and are subsequently denied are referred to specialized training programs that tailor services based on the information gathered during the SSI disability determination process. Finally, in Wisconsin, the W-2 administrator described a supported employment program they offer to serve W-2 participants with disabilities. As discussed above, however, this administrator indicated that they had not yet begun to fully focus on the hard-to-serve in Wisconsin.

3. *Welfare Safety Net for People with Disabilities*

Interviewees in three of the states we visited indicated that the AFDC/TANF reforms have, in some ways, disrupted social supports for people with disabilities. As discussed above, advocates in Wisconsin believed that the lack of knowledge on the part of new TANF program staff has resulted in persons with disabilities not obtaining the welfare services for which they are eligible and badly need. A similar view was expressed by a few interviewees in Michigan who indicated that the TANF program is being poorly implemented due to the inexperience of new staff and high staff turnover rates, but the impact of this on people with disabilities was believed to be rather small.

Interviewees in two states expressed concern about the effect of welfare reform on persons with non-severe disabilities. In Florida, interviewees indicated that the WAGES program was not set up to adequately address the needs of those with non-severe disabilities and expressed some concern about what would happen to these individuals when their time limits had elapsed. In Wisconsin, advocates alleged that persons with non-severe disabilities have the perception that the W-2 program is only for able-bodied individuals who have the capacity to work. These

individuals, who are not eligible for SSI, are not applying to participate in the W-2 program because of this perception, and therefore no longer have any major source of public support.

As discussed above, advocates in Wisconsin also believed that the state's welfare diversion policy extended to SSI, Food Stamps, and Medicaid. They indicated that this, along with the lack of knowledge about welfare resources among W-2 staff and confusion about where to go for services on the part of welfare clients, has caused a large increase in the demand for the local services that their organizations provide (emergency assistance, food pantries, homeless shelters).

4. SSA Program Administration

In Wisconsin, interviews with SSA field office staff identified implications of welfare reform, other than caseload effects, for the SSA programs. State reforms in Wisconsin have had several impacts on the administration of SSA programs at the local level. These include the following:

- The structure and level of payment under the new W-2 program rendered W-2 participants applying for SSI ineligible. W-2 participants in the W-2 Transitions category of the program (the category where persons with disabilities or other impediments to employment are placed) receive a fixed stipend of \$628 per month. The manner in which this stipend is counted for purposes of SSI eligibility rendered SSI applicants participating in W-2 ineligible for SSI. Once the issue was identified, the state instituted a "state-only" payment status category for W-2 participants applying for SSI (state-only funds are excluded from SSI income eligibility calculations). There has been some difficulty, however, in identifying SSI applicants in W-2 and instituting the state-only payment status. Delays in obtaining the state-only status has had negative repercussions for SSI applicants who become eligible for SSI in establishing date of eligibility, and receiving retroactive payments.
- As part of Wisconsin's welfare reform, changes in the manner in which child support payments are made to TANF recipients were instituted. Under the current system, child support payments are passed through to TANF recipients and their TANF payment is unaffected by the child support payment. Child support payments only affect whether or not the family would meet income eligibility requirements for participation in TANF, not the fixed W-2 payment received. This has had an effect on the way the local SSA field offices administer SSI benefits because the monthly incomes of SSI/TANF families receiving child support may be much more volatile, resulting in the need for SSA to track child support payments and correct over- and under-payments for SSI more frequently than before welfare reform. The local field offices do not currently have data linkages established with the state's child support enforcement agencies, but are initiating discussion with the state to establish such links in the future. In the absence of a data linkage, the burden of providing evidence of child support payments, or lack thereof, now falls on the SSI recipient.
- A final change in Wisconsin's welfare programs relates to the state's SSI supplement. Wisconsin now utilizes a private contractor, not SSA, to administer the state supplement. One effect of this has been increased confusion on the part of SSI recipients. Now, field office staff must refer recipients to a different entity for issues related to the state supplement.

We did not identify any perceived effects of non-SSA welfare reforms on the administration of the SSA programs in any of the four other states we visited.

B. Effect of SSA Reforms

1. DA&A Reforms

Of the states we visited, only interviewees in California and Michigan indicated large effects of the DA&A reforms in their states. Both of these states have very large populations of persons with DA&A impairments, ranking first and second in the nation, respectively. Of California's approximately 44,000 DA&A recipients who were to have their benefits terminated on December 31, 1996, approximately one-third successfully appealed their terminations and were able to retain their eligibility for SSI and/or DI. California counties have had to absorb many of the approximately 30,000 remaining persons into their General Relief programs. This shift has had a substantial budgetary impact on county governments, as the counties are required by state law to pay cash benefits and provide medical assistance to all indigent populations not covered by other programs. Michigan had approximately 15,000 DA&A cases receiving termination notices, and of these, 38 percent requalified for benefits on the basis of a different disability. Staff in Michigan also indicated that the DA&A reforms were difficult to implement because of the multiple changes in policies. They indicated that implementation of the new policy probably varied considerably across field offices.³²

2. Childhood Disability Reforms

Interviewees in three states, Connecticut, Florida, and Michigan, indicated that the SSA childhood disability reforms had a significant effect in their states. In Connecticut and Michigan, SSA field office staff indicated that the childhood disability provisions had a large effect on their workloads and required resources to be shifted away from other activities (such as Continuing Disability Reviews, CDRs) to accommodate the processing and re-processing of childhood disability claims. Interviewees in Florida commented that the childhood reforms, coupled with the non-citizen reforms, created an "administrative fiasco," the effects of which are still being experienced by Florida SSA field offices and the state DDS.³³

3. Non-Citizen Reforms

Notable effects of the SSA reforms related to non-citizens were perceived in California and Florida. In California, both the State and county governments were expecting to absorb the cost of nearly 190,000 non-citizens whose SSI eligibility was eliminated under PRWORA. Although

³² For additional information on DA&A reforms, see The Lewin Group (1998). *Policy Evaluation of the Effect of Legislation Prohibiting the Payment of Disability Benefits to Individuals Whose disability is Based on Drug Addiction and Alcoholism: Interim Report*. Report prepared for the Social Security Administration, July 21, 1998.

³³ For additional information on childhood disability reforms, see RAND (1998). *Background and Study Design Report for Policy Evaluation of the Effect of the 1996 Welfare Reform Legislation on SSI Benefits for Disabled Children*. Report prepared for the Social Security Administration, April 1998.

the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 restored SSI eligibility to most of these non-citizens, the threat of their termination produced significant political debate at both the state and county level as well as administrative turmoil within the State and county social services agencies, and at SSA District Offices. In addition, the State developed the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI), a state-only, SSI look-alike program for non-citizens with disabilities. In Florida, Dade County experienced a disproportionately large impact as a result of the reforms affecting non-citizens. In addition to the SSA offices already existing in Dade County, SSA established three temporary offices to review the cases of the more than 60,000 Dade County residents who were aged and disabled non-citizens receiving SSI and at risk of losing their SSI eligibility.

C. State Welfare Evaluation Efforts

We identified a variety of completed and ongoing welfare evaluation efforts in the five states we visited.³⁴ The majority of the evaluation efforts included the use of state welfare program administrative data. In several instances, these data have been matched to administrative data from other programs such as Food Stamps reciprocity data and Unemployment Insurance earnings data. Some evaluation efforts, including the Family Transition Program in Florida, the California Employment Readiness Demonstration Project, the Connecticut Jobs First evaluation, and the Wisconsin evaluation of W-2 work incentives, also utilize an experimental design. Other evaluations, like those being conducted by Florida State University of Florida's WAGES program and by the Family Independence Agency in Michigan, rely primarily on surveys of current and former program participants, including those who have been sanctioned or had their benefits terminated due to non-compliance with work requirements. An evaluation being conducted in Wisconsin will examine one-year outcomes for W-2 applicants and participants through surveys administered both at first program contact and one-year following first contact. Nearly all of the evaluations identified contain a component in which the evaluators assess program participant outcomes in areas such as employment status, income security, participation in other programs, and health. An evaluation by Michigan's Family Independence Agency, however, is the only evaluation we identified in the five states to have specifically addressed transitions from AFDC/TANF to SSI.³⁵ Studying the outcomes of approximately 100 families whose TANF cases were closed due to non-compliance with work requirements, the Family Independence Agency discovered that approximately 7 percent of these families went on to participate in SSI.

While only one of the evaluations identified specifically analyzed transitions from AFDC/TANF to SSI, the methodologies and findings of most of the studies could serve to inform a future evaluation by SSA of the effects of welfare reform on its programs. Some evaluations, especially those being conducted in California, have the potential to be used by SSA as stepping off points for its own evaluation efforts, perhaps by negotiating for add-on work in some cases. One evaluation, California's Employment Readiness Demonstration Project, is likely to be of particular interest to SSA. This evaluation, being conducted by a research team from the California State University-Bakersfield, is assessing the outcomes of participants in the

³⁴ Chapter 2 of this report contains further information on the welfare evaluations in the site visit and other states.

³⁵ Although information on enrollment in SSI will be included in the evaluation of one-year outcomes under W-2, this information has not yet been published.

Employment Readiness Demonstration Project, an eight-county project providing intensive employment and support services to over 1,500 “hard to serve” TANF recipients, including people with disabilities.

A list of the primary contacts for the evaluations identified in each state is presented in *Exhibit 3.1* at the end of this chapter.

D. State Data Sources

The States of California, Connecticut, Florida, and Wisconsin all have existing welfare and/or Medicaid databases that could be matched to SSA data and used to evaluate transitions from AFDC/TANF to SSI. Michigan is currently developing a longitudinal database that would facilitate similar evaluation activities. In addition, Los Angeles County recently constructed a longitudinal database to track TANF participants in the County. Although these data systems are generally rich in detail, some do not provide very good longitudinal histories of program participation.

The California and Florida data systems currently provide the best longitudinal histories. California’s Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System (MEDS) Longitudinal Database provides program participation information on 10 percent of the State’s Medi-Cal population back to 1987. Similarly, Florida’s Department of Children and Families data system provides longitudinal AFDC/TANF eligibility histories back to 1993. All of the state officials with whom we spoke stated that they would be willing, within the parameters of federal law and regulation, to share the state’s administrative data with SSA as long as the SSA studies would yield information of interest to the state. They were also willing to work with SSA to overcome data confidentiality issues and believed that most confidentiality issues could be resolved.³⁶ State officials did not foresee any substantial legal or technical obstacles to the sharing of administrative data with SSA.

A list of the primary contacts for the administrative data sources identified in each state is presented in *Exhibit 3.2* at the end of this chapter.

³⁶ One exception is with respect to access to Los Angeles County CalWORKs data. State law prohibits outside access to data on General Relief recipients. Los Angeles County officials with whom we spoke indicated that county employees, acting under subcontract to SSA, could perform analyses of GR data matched to SSA data.

Exhibit 3.1
Welfare Evaluation Contacts in the Site Visit States

| EVALUATION | CONTACT |
|---|---|
| California | |
| CalWORKs Evaluation | <p>Werner Schink Chief, Research and Evaluation Branch, Program and Planning and Performance Division California Department of Social Services 744 P Street Sacramento, CA 95814 916-654-1327</p> <p>Jacob Klerman RAND 1700 Main Street P.O. Box 2138 Santa Monica, California 90407-2138 310-393-0411</p> |
| Employment Readiness Demonstration Project | <p>Werner Schink Chief, Research and Evaluation Branch, Program and Planning and Performance Division California Department of Social Services 744 P Street Sacramento, CA 95814 916-654-1327</p> |
| Los Angeles County CalWORKs | <p>Manuel Moreno, Ph.D. Urban Research Division Chief Administrative Office, Los Angeles County 754 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90012 213-974-4267</p> |
| Connecticut | |
| Jobs First Evaluation | <p>Dan Bloom Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation 19th Floor 16 East 34 Street New York, NY 10016-4326 212-532-3200</p> |
| Florida | |
| Florida Transition Program (FTP) | <p>Barbara Goldman and Dan Bloom Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation 16 East 34th St., 19th Floor New York, NY 10016-4326 212-532-3200</p> |
| Work and Gain Economic Self-Sufficiency (WAGES) | <p>Robert Crew, Ph.D., Associate Dean College of Social Sciences Florida State University P.O. Box 2160 Tallahassee, FL 32306-2160 850-644-6284</p> |

Exhibit 3.1 (continued)
Welfare Evaluation Contacts in the Site Visit States

| EVALUATION | CONTACT |
|--|---|
| Michigan | |
| To Strengthen Michigan's Families Evaluation | Alan Werner Abt Associates, Inc. 55 Wheeler Street Cambridge, MA, 02138-1168 617-492-7100 |
| Family Independence Agency Non-Compliance Evaluation | Charles Overbey Family Independence Agency 235 South Grand Avenue Suite 1305 Grand Tower Lansing, MI 48909 517 373-6830 |
| Wisconsin | |
| Institute for Research on Poverty Evaluations | Tom Kaplan, Senior Scientist Institute for Research on Poverty University of Wisconsin - Madison 1180 Observatory Drive Madison, WI 53706 608-262-0345 |
| New Hope Evaluation | Robert C. Granger Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation 19th Floor 16 East 34 th Street New York, NY 10016-4326 212-340-8656 |

Exhibit 3.2

State Administrative Data Contacts

| DATA RESOURCE | CONTACT |
|---|--|
| California | |
| MediCal Eligibility Data System | Werner Schink Chief, Research and Evaluation Branch, Program and Planning and Performance Division California Department of Social Services 744 P Street Sacramento, CA 95814 916-654-1327 |
| UC Data Welfare Research Archive | Henry E. Brady, Ph.D. Professor of Political Science and Public Policy Director, UC Data Archive & Technical Assistance University of California - Berkeley Department of Political Science 210 Barrows # 1950 Berkeley, CA 94720-1950 510-642-3008 |
| LA County CalWORKS Longitudinal Database | Manuel Moreno, Ph.D. Urban Research Division Chief Administrative Office, Los Angeles County 754 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90012 213-974-4267 |
| Connecticut | |
| Connecticut Department of Social Services Administrative Data | Kevin Loveland Family Services Director Department of Social Services 25 Sigourney Street Hartford, CT 06106-2055 860-424-5031 |
| Florida | |
| Florida Department of Children and Families Administrative Data | Don Winstead Welfare Reform Director Department of Children and Families 1317 Winewood Blvd., Bldg. 3 Room 406G Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700 850-921-5567 |
| Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) | Jay Pfeiffer, Director Workforce Education & Outcomes Info Service Florida Department of Education Florida Education Center, Turlington Bldg, Rm 844 325 West Gaines St. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400 850-487-0900 |

Exhibit 3.2 (continued)
State Administrative Data Contacts

| DATA RESOURCE | CONTACT |
|---|--|
| Michigan | |
| Family Independence Agency Administrative Data | Charles Overbey Family Independence Agency 235 South Grand Avenue Suite 1305 Grand Tower Lansing, MI 48909 517 373-6830 |
| Wisconsin | |
| Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development Administrative Data | Sue Larsen Bureau of Welfare Initiatives Economic Support Division Department of Workforce Development 1 West Wilson Street P.O. Box 7935 Madison, WI 53707-7935 608-266-3288 |

THIS PAGE BLANK